



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/781,999

02/19/2004

Shuichi Ohkubo

17449

5322

23389

7590

07/02/2008

SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC

400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA

SUITE 300

GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

VERDERAME, ANNA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1795

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/02/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action**  
**Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/781,999

**Applicant(s)**

OHKUBO, SHUICHI

**Examiner**

ANNA L. VERDERAME

**Art Unit**

1795

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 24 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): of claims 1, 4, and 9 over Seo et al. in view of Bechevet et al.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: none.  
Claim(s) objected to: none.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 2, 5, 7 and 10.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Martin J Angebrannt/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant states that the specific composition of claim 1 is critical for realizing improved C/N ratios. This composition and the resulting improved C/N ratios are disclosed by Seo et al. Particularly, see table 1 of Seo wherein C/N ratios of 36 to 53 are recited. In regard to the amendment which requires that "each of the first and second information-recording layers is equal to or greater than 6nm and equal to or smaller than 13 nm" the examiner points to the disclosure of cited reference Rie et al. wherein a first recording layer has a thickness of between 3-9 nm and the second recording layer has a thickness of 12 nm. The applicant argues that they have shown unexpected results over the range of 6nm to 13 nm. This is incorrect. In the first embodiment disks wherein each of the 2 recording layers have a thickness of 8 nm are formed. Recording layers have compositions as taught in table 1, having a specific compositional range like that recited in instant claim 1 give a C/N ratio of equal to or higher than 25 dB. In these example y ranges from 0.02 to 0.1. These C/N ratios are less than those recited by Seo et al. In a second embodiment discs wherein both recording layers have a thickness of 8 nm are formed. The recording compositions of these layers are taught in table 2. In these compositions y is always 0.1. These discs have higher C/N ratios than in example 1, but the C/N ratios are comparable to those taught in Seo et al. The only difference between applicant's embodiment 1 and 2 is the recording layer composition. Therefore the increased C/N ratios are likely a result of this change and not a result of recording layer thickness. The applicant has not shown criticality of the range 6nm to 13 nm. No examples outside of this range are given. Further, applicant has not provided evidence that change in C/N is a result of the thickness of the recording layer and not a result of the recording composition.